## Confinement: social, cultural, economic ... but above all, scientific.

## Pier Francesco Moretti – 10 June 2020

Humans are social animals, so they say. Yet many human behaviors do not seem to favor the sustainability of the community as a whole. In fact, from anthropology and other scientific disciplines we know that we are social for convenience, to guarantee access to resources and therefore to transmit the survival of our genes. We often, if not almost always, witness an evolution of chaotic and almost homogeneous processes towards a self-organized dualism, or what is called polarization of ideas, of behaviors, of groups: me against you, us against you, rich against poor, whites against blacks, fascists against communists, masters against workers. Even if it were not a problem of "opposition", it would still be an identification and recognition of diversity, of distancing.

On the contrary, we know that diversity has always led to survival in a wider context, that is, not focusing on individuals but on the general concept, on the functional information of life for example. The concept of "different" implies that of bond, and therefore of network, or of hierarchy in the simplest case: who above and who below, who better and who worse.

There are other distances that are often neglected, or often accepted as a fact: those between science and ethics, between science and politics, between science and religion, between science and technology.

Within the scientific community we also face a strong distancing between the so-called hard sciences and humanistic disciplines, considering the former reliable because providing more accurate predictions and explanations, while the latter more vague and difficult to formulate. If instead we think of chaos theories and quantum mechanics, which both distort the concepts of prediction and certainty, we could learn how much the philosophical and social implications/links they can have and have had. Historically, science was primarily assessed as the art of knowing, and did not have a great differentiation from philosophy or politics. The largest difference was probably consisting in the role of human existence in the universe: Protagoras against Plato/Antistene. Does the world exist independently of humans, and what humans believes to exist is the real world?

Hence the role of humankind, the meaning of life and its relationship with nature. The reflection should be focused again on the fact that no one "serves" or "enslaves" to the other, or again on not to identify a contrast or diversity, but instead the limits and strengths of being "*Sapiens*". Science detached from religion because it "served" to solve many problems thanks to technological/ industrial developments: it reduced fatigue, reduced repetitive and tedious tasks, reduced exposure to dangerous environments and diseases. In a struggle for supremacy, science, religion and politics, assigned different battlegrounds, avoiding confrontation. The battlefields however have a fundamental characteristic: they are defined in space and time.

This sort of non-belligerence treaty had then to deal with globalization, which allows ideas, problems and people to spread everywhere and immediately. We therefore now attend mixed committees between scientists and politicians, whose dialogue process probably does not identify with clarity and transparency the common assumptions and objectives, continuing to face challenges such as succession or combination of temporally independent and localized events in space. A process which shows a truly involvement at same footing between scientists and decision-makers without interfaces or hierarchies is not easy to design and implement, but some attempts are under development (see school4sid.cnr.it). We indeed do not attend mixed committees between scientists and "religious". They exist, but they are not very famous and mainly associated with the relationships between science and spirituality, often linked to less hierarchical and dogmatic religions than the most widespread ones.

They usually include a group of willing people, without prejudice for the many but certainly influenced by their personal and cultural experiences, coming from different disciplines (physics, mathematics, psychology, sociology, neurology, genetics) and with well-recognized top-scientists (i.e Wolgang Pauli, Carl Jung, Roger Penrose, Ilya Prigogine, Peter Fenwick).

Their main goal is to reconcile theories and descriptions of reality that surpass the concept of reductionism, and can lead to a unity of "thought and behavior" that takes into account our human condition, that is, vital machines that are the result of Darwinian evolution. For those who believe in Darwin's theory clearly, and for those who don't.

I suggest two "extreme" readings, both in English: Proving Darwin and "NDE: docking back to planet hEart". The first is the only attempt to propose a mathematical formulation of the theory of Darwin, the latter considered by me, perhaps erroneously, one of the theories that do not have a mathematical explanation but only a narrative based on observations. The other is an attempt to explain the so-called near-death experiences through a mix of theory and narrative, through a short story that anticipates a dedicated book. Look for them on the web, or ask the authors, because the search is an indication of motivation, commitment, satisfaction.